

RESOLUTIONS

H 1113

OF THE

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,

ON THE

SUBJECT OF SLAVERY;

WITH THE

SPEECH OF SAMUEL D. HASTINGS,

IN THE ASSEMBLY,

MADISON, JANUARY 27, 1840.

NEW YORK:

WILLIAM HARNED, 61 JOHN STREET.
1849.

RESOLUTIONS.

*The following Resolutions were reported to the Assembly at
Madison, Wisconsin, January 23, 1849:*

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Wisconsin, That chattel Slavery as it exists in the United States is contrary to natural justice, a libel upon our free institutions, and is destructive of the best interests of the whole people; therefore its extension should be prohibited by every constitutional means within the power of Congress, and all national laws which establish, maintain, or in any way countenance or sanction its existence as a national institution, should be immediately repealed.

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be and they are hereby instructed, and our Representatives are requested—

1st, To oppose the passage of any act for the government of New Mexico and California, or any other territory belonging to the United States, or which may hereafter be acquired, unless it shall contain a provision forever prohibiting the introduction and existence of slavery or involuntary servitude into said territories, except as a punishment for crime, of which the party shall have been duly convicted according to law.

2d, To oppose the admission of any new State into the Union, without a provision in its Constitution expressly prohibiting the existence of chattel slavery within its limits.

3d, To exert their influence to procure the repeal of all laws sustaining slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, or in any other place under the control of the national government, and to secure the passage of laws prohibiting slavery and the slave trade in all places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government.

4th, To oppose all legislation on the part of Congress which favors the interests of slavery and slave labor, at the expense of freedom and free labor, and to exert their influence to procure such legislation as will be equal and just in its operation upon all sections of the Union.

*Resolved, That His Excellency the Governor is hereby requested immediately to forward a copy of the foregoing resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to be by them laid before Congress.**

SPEECH:

MR. CHAIRMAN—

Having first proposed the resolutions now under consideration, and being Chairman of the Committee which reported them to the Assembly, I must acknowledge that I feel a deep interest in the action of this body in relation to them, and I cannot refrain from adding, that the disposition which has

* See last page.

been manifested on all sides to give them a full and candid discussion, has been to me a matter of the highest gratification.

"Error of opinion," we are told, "may be safely tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it," and if I should chance, in the course of my remarks, to assume positions that are not tenable, or to make statements that will not stand the test of the closest scrutiny, it is a matter of gratulation that there are those here who can expose the errors and present the facts in their true light. I firmly believe that the sentiments of the resolutions are correct, and that the positions which they assume are those which should be occupied by this legislature; and because I thus believe, and for no other reason, do I desire their adoption. If I am wrong in my views, no one can rejoice more heartily than I will to be set right. Therefore, I beg a patient and candid hearing.

The resolutions assert that "chattel slavery, as it exists in the United States, is contrary to natural justice, is a libel upon our free institutions, and is destructive of the best interests of the whole people."

Are these propositions true? *What is "chattel slavery, as it exists in the United States?"* Not, what was the nature of the servitude that existed in the days of Abraham, nor the character of the bondage among the Jews; not what was slavery at any previous time, nor in any other place; but what is slavery to-day, in these United States.

It is the assumption of property in man,—it is the reduction of a human being, made in the image of God, a little lower than the angels, and crowned with glory and honor—a being, who, according to our Declaration of Independence, possesses an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,—the reduction of such a being to a mere article of merchandise—a piece of property, a chattel personal.

The Louisiana code says, "A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, and his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master."

The law of South Carolina is as follows: "Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be chattels personal in the hands of their owners and possessors,

their executors, administrators, and assigns, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever."

Judge Stroud, in his work on the Slave Laws of the United States, says: "This dominion of the master is as unlimited as that which is tolerated by the laws of any civilized community in relation to brute animals."

The principles of slavery, as here set forth, are in direct opposition to the principles of our Declaration of Independence, to the Constitution of the United States, and to that of our own State. They are the antagonists of Justice, Humanity, Democracy, and Christianity. As a Christian, Republican nation, by our professions we have recognized the broad principles of human brotherhood,—we have placed the whole human family upon one common platform,—we have regarded all as the children of a common Parent, and as possessing, equally, an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The question which this nation, and we as a legislative body, are now called to decide is simply this: Shall this institution of chattel slavery—an institution so contrary to right and justice, so opposed to Democracy and Christianity—be extended; shall its cords be lengthened, and its stakes strengthened, *by our authority*; and shall it longer exist where we as a nation are responsible for its existence, and possess the constitutional power to remove it? The issue is made, and it must be met. It is an issue between Right and Wrong, between Justice and Oppression, between Liberty and Slavery. It is **THE GREAT QUESTION** of the age.

Its settlement involves the future destiny of our nation, and will exert a mighty influence upon the well being of the other nations of the earth. Should Right, and Justice, and Liberty be defeated in this, their chosen home, sad and gloomy will be the prospects of the oppressed and down trodden of the old world. Upon the settlement of this issue depends the question whether we shall remain a free, united and happy people, the beacon light of hope to the poor and distressed of other nations, and the home of the oppressed from all climes and countries, or whether we shall be broken into fragments, our institutions overturned and destroyed, our country involved in civil commotion, and the star of our glory set in the midnight of anarchy and desolation. Perhaps some may regard my views as extravagant

and fanatical. The views which I hold, are the result of calm, deliberate and candid investigation; and if you will bear with me for a short season, I trust I shall be able to convince some at least of their correctness.

All will doubtless admit that there are certain great and immutable laws which govern us as human beings, and that there are certain great principles of truth, justice and right, which lie at the foundation of all the obligations we owe to our Creator, and to our fellow men. If individuals and nations act in harmony with these great and immutable laws, they will be prosperous and happy. If they disregard them and trample upon their requirements, they injure their own happiness and destroy their own peace and prosperity. The only true and legitimate object of government and of legislation is to discover these great laws, and to declare and enforce them. And just in proportion as this is accomplished, will legislation tend to secure the best good of those who are its subjects.

We have heard in this Hall within the past few days, much about the laws of trade, and of the folly of attempting to legislate in opposition to them. It is well understood that no legislation will be of any real benefit, which conflicts with any fixed and unalterable law that exists in the nature of things, such as the law of gravitation, the laws of trade, of supply and demand. In sanctioning the existence and extension of chattel slavery, we are trampling upon great fundamental truths which we ourselves have acknowledged and proclaimed to the world, and are violating a great and immutable law, a due regard to which is essential to our happiness and prosperity as a nation. If it be true that ALL MEN are created equal and possess an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, then it will be an absolute impossibility for us to deprive a portion of our fellow beings of any of these rights, without greatly injuring ourselves.

It was a great mistake, a fundamental wrong, ever to reduce a human being to the condition of a chattel slave; and after he was once in this condition, it was a grievous wrong to continue him in it, and justice, humanity, democracy, and the dictates of enlightened self-interest demand that the wrong should be at once redressed.

This issue has not been sprung upon us in a moment, without warning. The great principles of Right and Wrong,

of Liberty and Slavery, are active principles. They are ever at work, and ever at war. Wherever they come in contact, there is a strife for the mastery. The Declaration of American Independence, and the adoption of the United States Constitution, were grand movements in behalf of right and liberty. For a while the right and the true seemed to be in the ascendant, and had they retained their supremacy for a few years longer, every trace of slavery and oppression would have disappeared, and truth and justice would have been triumphant. But the friends of these great principles, having secured their own liberties, in very many instances began to relax their efforts, and were content to allow things to remain as they were. Those who were interested in sustaining and perpetuating slavery, took advantage of this inactivity and indifference, and believing they could make it advantageous to their own selfish ends, set themselves at work to enlarge and strengthen this evil institution. And they have been at work diligently and earnestly, with a fixed and determined purpose, gaining strength and courage by each successive triumph, from that time until the present moment. They have been so far successful, that they have monopolized the majority of the officers of the general government at home and abroad, and have controlled the legislation of the country; and when their "peculiar institution" has been in danger, they have been united as one man, and by sowing discord among the people of the North, have kept them divided among themselves, so that they have succeeded in accomplishing their own favorite purposes. They have gone on from one step to another until they have forced the present issue upon the country, in such a shape that we can no longer keep it out of view, or refrain from meeting it. What position will the state of Wisconsin occupy on this great question?

Will she, by the act of her representatives now assembled, take her stand on the side of Liberty and the right? Or will she throw her influence into the scale with slavery and oppression? Will she take a position in harmony with the great and immutable laws which lie at the foundation of our prosperity and happiness as a nation? Or will she array herself against them? The adoption of the resolutions now under consideration, I think will place her in her true position; and in presenting a few considerations in their support, I shall

advocate them generally, without arguing each distinct proposition by itself.

Slavery once existed in New Mexico and California, while they were under the Mexican government. On the 15th day of September, A. D. 1829—almost 20 years since—the President of the Mexican Republic published to the world the following decree :

“ Be it known : That in the year 1829, being desirous of signalizing the anniversary of our Independence by an act of national justice and beneficence, which may contribute to the strength and support of such inestimable welfare, as to secure more and more the public tranquility, and reinstate an unfortunate portion of our inhabitants in the sacred rights granted them by nature, that they may be protected by the nation under wise and just laws, according to the provision in Article 30 of the Constitutional Act; availing myself of the extraordinary facilities granted me, I have thought proper to
DECREE :

“ 1st. That Slavery be exterminated in the Republic.

“ 2d. Consequently those are free, who up to this day have been looked upon as Slaves.

“ 3d. Whenever the circumstances of the public treasury will allow it, the owners of Slaves shall be indemnified, in the manner which the laws shall provide.

“ JOSE MARIA DE BOCANEGRA.

“ Mexico, Sept. 15th, A. D. 1829.”

In the progress of events, Mexico has been dismembered. A portion of her territory has been transferred to a neighboring Republic—a Republic boasting of its Democracy and of its free and liberal institutions; and a portion of the inhabitants of this Republic are claiming the right to re-establish the institution of Slavery in these newly-acquired territories.—Twenty years from the time it was abolished by a comparatively ignorant people, the inhabitants of the freest and most enlightened nation of the earth, are claiming the right to re-establish it! Truly our nation is fulfilling its glorious mission!

The inhabitants of these territories are unwilling that Slavery should be again established in their midst. A delegated Convention, recently held in New Mexico, sent a petition to the United States Congress, in which we find the following language :

"We do not desire to have domestic slavery within our borders, and until the time shall arrive for our admission into the Union, we desire to be protected by Congress against its introduction among us."

Is it not a reasonable request? And shall they not be protected? Is not Slavery a curse, a blight, a mildew, an incubus upon the prosperity of any community where it exists? If such be the fact, then their request is a reasonable one, and we are bound to grant them that protection which they seek.

Probably the best way to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the influence of Slavery upon a community, will be to compare the section of the country where it exists, with the one where it does not exist. At the time of the adoption of the United States Constitution, the Slaveholding States possessed an area of territory far greater than that possessed by the non-slaveholding States—with a more genial climate, a more fertile soil, and a free white population nearly as numerous. They had the advantage over the free States in almost every respect, and had there been nothing in their midst to interfere with their prosperity, the unavoidable inference would have been, that they would soon outstrip the North in population and wealth, and in all those things which go to make up the prosperity and glory of a nation.—But what are the facts?

First, in respect to population? According to the first census taken in 1790, the free white population of the free States outnumbered that of the slave States - - 629,080
By the 2d census, in 1800, the number was

increased to	-	-	-	-	-	938,529
By the 3d census, in 1810, to	-	-	-	-	-	1,244,434
By the 4th census, in 1820, to	-	-	-	-	-	2,198,031
By the 5th census, in 1830, to	-	-	-	-	-	3,215,862
By the 6th census, in 1840, to	-	-	-	-	-	4,924,425

By the census of 1840, the free white population of the free states amounted to 9,557,065, while the free white population of the slave states amounted to 4,632,640—the excess of the free over the slave states being more than the whole number of the free white population of the South, by 291,783. Why is this? With all the advantages which the South possessed over the North, why is it that the North has gained so rapidly in population, and left the South so far in the rear? Will some one who regards Slavery as a good

institution, or who considers it a matter of too small moment to occupy our attention, please explain the reason of the superior growth of the non-slaveholding over the slaveholding states ?

Let us notice, in the next place, the comparative value of the land in the free and slave states. It is a fact notorious throughout the length and breadth of the country, that the land in the free states bears a much higher price than it does in the slave states. The disparity in many cases is very great, amounting to two, three, and even five hundred per cent. Why is this ? Is not the land in the slaveholding states naturally as good as it is in the non-slaveholding states ? We are all aware, that, generally, in a state of nature, it is vastly better ; but it has upon its bosom the incubus of slavery, and under the palsy of this curse it becomes barren and unfruitful, and comparatively valueless. Some of the finest portions of the South have been given up to be overrun by weeds and underbrush ; briars and thorns have covered the once well-cultivated fields, and the habitations of man have become the abodes of the wild beasts of the forest. This is the case of a portion of the once beautiful estate of Washington (Meunt Vernon) upon the banks of the Potomac. Gen. Washington, in a letter to Sir John Sinclair, gives us the reason for the depreciation of southern lands : " Because there are in Pennsylvania laws for the gradual abolition of slavery, which neither Maryland nor Virginia have at present."

Wm. Pinckney, in the Maryland House of Delegates, in 1789, made use of the following language : " ' Even the earth itself,' says Montesquieu, ' which teems with profusion under the cultivating hand of the free-born laborer, shrinks into barrenness from the contaminating sweat of the slave.' This sentiment is not more figuratively beautiful, than substantially just. Survey the countries, Sir, where the hand of freedom conducts the plowshare, and compare their products with yours. Your granaries, in this view, appear like the store-houses of emmets, though not supported with equal industry."

Gov. Randolph, in his address to the Virginia Legislature, in 1820, spoke as follows : " The deplorable error of our ancestors, in copying a civil institution from savage Africa, has affixed upon their posterity a depressing burden, which nothing but the extraordinary benefits conferred by

our climate would have enabled us to support. We have been far outstripped by states, to whom nature has been far less bountiful. It is painful to consider what might have been, under other circumstances, the *amount of general wealth* in Virginia, or the whole sum of comfortable subsistence and happiness possessed by all her inhabitants."

In the Virginia Legislature, in 1832, Mr. Summers spoke as follows: "Sir, the evils of the system cannot be enumerated. It were unnecessary to attempt it. They glare upon us at every step. When the owner looks to his wasted estate, he knows and feels them. When the statesman examines the condition of his country, he finds her moral influence gone, her physical strength diminished, her political power waning, he sees and must confess them."

Mr. Faulkner, in the same Legislature, made use of the following language: "If there be one who considers the institution of slavery harmless, let him compare the condition of the slaveholding portion of this commonwealth—barren, desolate, and seared, as it were, by the avenging hand of Heaven—with the description which we have of this same country from those who first broke its virgin soil. To what is this change ascribed? Alone to the withering and blasting effects of slavery."

In 1790, Kentucky contained 73,000 inhabitants, while Ohio contained but 3,000; in 1840, Ohio contained 1,500,000, while Kentucky contained but 780,000. Why should Ohio increase so much more rapidly than Kentucky, while there is nothing but a narrow river between them, with many natural advantages on the part of Kentucky? The estimated value of land in Kentucky, in 1846, was about six dollars per acre, while that in Ohio was worth at least double that sum. What but the curse of slavery makes the difference? Kentucky contains 25,514,720 acres of land, which at five dollars per acre would amount to \$127,573,600. If slavery did not exist there, it would, to say the least, be worth as much as land in Ohio, with an equal population; and if she had never tolerated slavery, her population would be greater now than that of Ohio. 25,514,720 acres, at ten dollars per acre, would amount to \$255,147,200. The whole value of the slaves in Kentucky, estimating them at \$300 each, would be in round numbers \$55,000,000. Hence, if slavery did not exist there, the land at the lowest calculation would be worth \$72,573,600 more than the present value of the land and slaves com-

bined! And shall we hesitate in exerting our influence to prevent this blighting curse from being fastened upon the immense territories of New Mexico and California?

In 1790, Virginia contained a population of 748,308, while New York had but 340,120. In 1840, New York contained 2,428,921, while Virginia had but 1,239,797—that of New York being about double that of Virginia.

Massachusetts contains a territory of 7,500 square miles, while South Carolina contains 28,000. The population of Massachusetts, in 1845, was 800,000; that of South Carolina, 600,000. The products of Massachusetts in one year, \$124,735,264; those of South Carolina, \$53,086,766. Production to each individual in Massachusetts, \$154; to each one in South Carolina, \$50. Scholars in common schools in Massachusetts, 160,259; in South Carolina, 12,528.—In academies in Massachusetts, 16,740; in South Carolina, 4,326. In colleges in Massachusetts, 769; in South Carolina, 188. Persons over 20 years of age in Massachusetts who cannot read and write, 4,448; in South Carolina, 20,615 whites and 327,000 slaves.

There are published in the non-slaveholding states 2,341 newspapers and periodicals, while there are published in the slaveholding states but 470. There are at the North 1,151 printing presses, and at the South only 401. At the North there are 374 binderies, and but 73 at the South.

The agricultural products of the North, according to the census of 1840, were \$562,391,157; those of the South, \$522,891,344.

The products of the manufactories of the North amounted to \$334,630,890, while those of the South amounted to but \$83,935,742.

The products of the mines of the North were \$44,244,663, while those of the South were \$11,510,933.

The products of the fisheries of the North were \$10,070,725; those of the South were \$1,519,188.

The products of the forest at the North amounted to \$12,677,905, while those of the South were but \$4,899,168.

The testimony of Southern men affords us the most conclusive evidence of the awful curse of slavery as it exists in their midst. Mr. Brodnax, in the Virginia Legislature of 1832, remarked as follows: "That slavery is an evil, a transcendent evil, it would be more than idle for any human being to doubt or deny. It is a mildew which has

blighted every region it has touched, from the creation of the world."

Mr. Curtis, in the same legislature, spoke as follows: "The prosperity and aggrandizement of a state is to be seen in its increase of inhabitants and consequent progress of industry and wealth. Of the vast tide of emigration which now rushes like a cataract to the west, not even a trickling rill wends its way to the ancient dominion. Of the multitude of foreigners, who daily seek an asylum and home in the empire of liberty, how many turn their steps to the region of the slave? None! No, not one! There is a malaria in the atmosphere of those regions, which the new comer shuns, as being deleterious to his views and habits. See the wide-spreading ruin which the avarice of our ancestral government has produced in the South, as witnessed in a sparse population of freemen, deserted habitations, and fields without culture. Strange to tell, even the wolf, driven back long since by the approach of man, now returns after the lapse of a hundred years, to howl over the desolations of slavery."

Wm. Gregg, of South Carolina, in a recently published work, makes use of the following language: "It is only necessary to travel over the sterile mountains of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, to learn the true secret of our difficulties—to learn the difference between indolence and industry, extravagance and economy. We there see the scenery which would take the place of our unpainted mansions, dilapidated cabins, with mud chimneys and no windows, broken down rail fences, fields overgrown with weeds, and thrown away to be taken up by pine thickets, and beef cattle unprotected from the inclemency of winter, and so poor as barely to preserve life."

Mr. Clowney, another South Carolinian, thus describes the condition of things in his native state: "Look at South Carolina now, with her houses deserted and falling to decay, her once fruitful fields worn out and abandoned for want of timely improvement or skilful cultivation, and her thousands of acres of inexhaustible lands still promising an abundant harvest to the industrious husbandman, lying idle and neglected. In the interior of the state where I was born, and where I now live, although a country possessing all the advantages of soil, climate, and health, abounding in arable land unreclaimed from the first rude state of nature, there

can now be found many neighborhoods where the population is too sparse to support a common elementary school for children. Such is the deplorable condition of one of the oldest members of the Union, that dates back its settlement more than a century and a half, while other states, born as it were, but yesterday, already surpass what Carolina is, or ever has been in the happiest and proudest days of her prosperity."

The Hon. Wm. C. Preston, of the same state, formerly a member of the United States Senate, speaks as follows: "No Southern man could journey (as he had recently done) through the Northern states, and witness the prosperity, the industry, the public spirit which they exhibit—the sedulous cultivation of all those arts by which life is rendered comfortable and respectable, without feelings of deep sadness and shame as he remembers his own neglected and desolate home. There, no dwelling is seen abandoned—not a farm uncultivated. Every person and every thing performs a part towards the great result: and the whole land is covered with fertile fields, with manufactories and canals, and railroads, and edifices, and towns, and cities."

What makes the difference so eloquently described? The deep and damning curse of slavery! Is it any wonder, then, the people of New Mexico petition to be protected from this awful curse? And shall we hesitate to do what within us lies to extend to them that protection?

The statistics of education will throw additional light upon the influence of slavery upon the South.

According to the census of 1840, there were "scholars at public charge" in the Free states 432,173—in the Slave states 35,580. Ohio alone had 51,812 such scholars, being 16,232 more than the whole number in all the slave states. Virginia, the largest state, had at public charge 9,791, while Rhode Island, the smallest state had 10,912. Gov. Clarke, of Kentucky in his message to the Legislature in 1838, remarked: "One third of the adult population of the state are unable to write their names." A recent Governor of Virginia proclaimed in his annual message that one quarter of the free white population could neither read nor write.

Many of the slave states have large school funds, but of what avail are they while the curse of slavery is resting upon them? Kentucky has one of more than a million of dollars:

Tennessee of two millions: yet in 1837, in Kentucky, one third of the adult population were unable to write their names, and in Tennessee, according to the last census, there were 58,531, of the same description of persons. In South Carolina, there is also a fund for the support of pauper schools, but this had become so useless, and was so disdained by the poor whites, that a late Governor of the state in his annual message recommended that it be withdrawn from them altogether.

The people of Wisconsin, by the provisions of their Constitution relating to schools, have shown that they have a correct estimate of the value of education.

In proportion, then, as we estimate the immense advantages of a general diffusion of knowledge, let us endeavor to confer these blessings upon others, by protecting them from the blighting curse of slavery.

The issue of Patents from the United States' Patent Office may be regarded as something of a test of the ingenuity and industry of the people in mechanical improvements, and the application of science to the useful arts. In 1847, 510 Patents were taken out by the inhabitants of the free states, while but 62 were taken out in the slave states.

The inability of the slave states to pay their own postage affords additional evidence of the impoverishing influence of slavery. The cost of the mail service at the South for several years past, has averaged \$500,000 more than the receipts from their post offices, while at the North the receipts have exceeded the cost by about the same amount; thus the North has paid its own postage and contributed 500,000 a year to make up the deficiency of the South. In 1843, the cost of the South was \$545,262 more than the whole amount of their receipts, while at the North, the receipts exceeded the cost of \$552,066.

In the year 1847, the new state of Wisconsin paid the expense of the mail service in her own limits, and \$17,660 to help make up the deficiency in the slave states.

The state of New York paid her own postage and \$265,449 besides, while the mail service in the states of Virginia and North Carolina cost \$241,464 more than the whole amount of their receipts.

The state of Massachusetts paid over an excess of \$110,809, after paying the whole cost of her own mail ser.

vice while the state of Georgia fell short of paying her own postage \$97,142.

What but the curse of slavery renders the slaveholding states dependent upon the free states for their mail facilities?

Slavery is anti-democratic in its doctrines and its practical results, and bears with an iron hand upon the well being of the poor white man—the non-slaveholder—who comes under its influence.

It is estimated that the whole number of slaveholders in the United States does not exceed 300,000, yet these 300,000 persons have the almost entire control of every thing at home in the midst of a population of upwards of 8,000,000, and for the past 15 or 20 years they have also had the almost entire control of the public offices and of the legislation of the National government. In addition to the 3,000,000 slaves at the south about 3,000,000 of whites, who, in consequence of the existence of slavery around them rendering honest labor disreputable, are in almost as deplorable a condition as the slaves themselves. Their condition is aptly described by Mr. Gregg, of South Carolina: “shall we pass unnoticed the thousands of poor, ignorant, degraded white people among us, who, in this land of plenty, live in comparative wretchedness and starvation? Many a one is reared in *proud* South Carolina, from birth to manhood, who has never passed a month in which he has not, some part of the time been stinted for meat. Many a mother is there who will tell you that her children are but scantily supplied with bread, and much more scantily with meat, and if they be clad with comfortable raiment, it is at the expense of these scanty allowances of food. These may be startling statements, but they are nevertheless true, and if not believed in Charleston, the members of our Legislature, who have traversed the state in electioneering campaigns, can attest their truth. With no regular means of gaining a subsistence, they live on from day to day and from year to year in a most deplorable condition. Ignorant and degraded, they prolong a miserable existence by occasional fishing, hunting, begging, and in some instances, stealing.”

Representatives of the free, intelligent, industrious and prosperous yeomanry of Wisconsin, living as they are in the enjoyment of the manifold blessings of the ordinance of 1787, will you consent that the withering curse of slavery shall be

fastened upon New Mexico and California, to bring in its train a class of wretched, ignorant and degraded individuals, such as those now living in some of our Southern States ?

In some portions of the South, the curse of slavery bears so heavily upon the poor whites as to deprive them of their dearest political rights. In South Carolina, the glorious Democratic state, *par excellence*, the poor man has actually no political rights. Would he aspire to fill the Gubernatorial chair ? The Constitution of the state declares him ineligible to the office, unless he is possessed of an estate worth 1500 pounds sterling above his debts ! Would he aspire to the next station—the office of Lieutenant Governor ? The same obstacle stands in the way of his eligibility. Would he be content to be a member of her Senate ? To be eligible to this station he must possess a freehold estate of the value of 300 pounds sterling clear of debt, or, if he is a non-resident of the district he wishes to represent, the estate must be worth 1000 pounds sterling clear of debt. Would his aspirations be satisfied by a seat in the Lower House, he must possess a freehold estate of 500 acres of land and ten negroes !! or real estate to the value of 150 pounds sterling clear of debt. Of how much value would we, in Wisconsin, regard the right of suffrage, if we were ineligible to office ? Would it not take from it one of its greatest claims ? But even this poor boon, valueless as it would seem to be in the circumstances, is taken from the poor white man in Democratic South Carolina ! Yes, Sir, in order to exercise the right of suffrage, a man must have a freehold of 50 acres of land or a town lot, or have paid a tax, the preceding year of three shillings sterling. Is this the kind of Democracy we would extend over New Mexico and California ? In North Carolina a man cannot vote for a member of the Senate unless he is the owner of 50 acres of land, and the requisites to render him eligible to any important office are such as to place them entirely beyond the reach of poor men. In old Democratic Virginia there is a property qualification for the exercise of the right of suffrage which shuts out its enjoyment from the poor whites.

You are doubtless aware, Sir, that in South Carolina the people do not vote directly for Presidential electors—they are chosen by the Legislature, a body which in fact does not represent the people of the state, but its capital, its money and its lands. At a recent session of the Legisla-

ture, a bill was introduced to allow the people to vote directly for Presidential electors—but it was defeated—and among the arguments urged against the passage of the bill, were the following by Mr. Boyce, a democratic member from Fairfield, as reported in the *South Carolinian*, (Columbia, S. C.) “The next objection to the proposed change is the tendency it would have to produce an ultra Democracy in our state. We have a Republic in our state government, with many conservative features. If we introduce the popular element into the Presidential election, an election which gives its own coloring to every other question of political policy—we may introduce into the government of the state a more democratic spirit than we imagine. This is the age of progress: the public mind in the United States is verging to extremes in questions of government and social order. . . . It is this extreme spirit of progress—a spirit unwilling to let anything stand as it is, perpetually calling for a change—change which under the form of philanthropy, is trying to destroy our domestic institutions. Here it is said, give this election to the people, it is their right, it is more congenial to liberty. There it is said, give liberty to every slave. I am unwilling to have anything to do with this spirit of progress. If we yield to it in this particular, it is easy to foresee that our state government will be popularized. The voice of the multitude will be heard louder and louder for a change. They will tear from your Constitution its conservative elements; they will, before many years, *be thundering at the doors of the Senate chamber for equality in representation*. . . . We will no longer be a Republic, but a *Democracy—a tumultuous, numerical Democracy*.”

The atmosphere of slavery fosters other sentiments which bear heavily upon the condition of the poor whites. Here we have a sample of *Virginia Democracy*, from the lips of B. Watkins Leigh, on the floor of the Virginia Convention, 1827: “I have as sincere a regard for that people as any man who lives among them. But, I ask gentleman to say, whether they believe that those who depend on their daily labor for their daily subsistence, can or ever do enter into political affairs? They never do—never will—never can.”

Mr. Pickens of South Carolina said, on the floor of Congress, in 1837: “All society settles down into a classifica-

tion of capitalists and laborers. The former will own the latter, either collectively through the government, or individually, in a state of domestic servitude, as exists in the southern states of this confederacy. If laborers ever obtain the political power of a country it is in fact in a state of revolution."

This glorious *Democracy* is still further explained by Geo. McDuffie of South Carolina. "No human institution, in my opinion, is more manifestly consistent with the will of God, than domestic slavery. *Domestic slavery, therefore, instead of being an evil, is the corner stone of our republican edifice.*"

John C. Calhoun adds his testimony as follows ; " We regard slavery as the most safe and stable basis for free institutions in the world. Every plantation is a little community, with the master at its head, who concentrates in himself the united interests of capital and labor, of which he is the common representative."

Are these the sentiments we would have prevail over the immense territory of New Mexico and California?

Another strong reason why we should pass the resolutions, and thus do what we can to prevent the further extension of slavery, is found in the present inequality of representation. By the ratio of representation established in the 2nd section of the first article of the United States Constitution, the North made a bad bargain, to say the least. Now by allowing slavery to extend, we greatly increase this inequality of representation, and weaken the rightful power of the North, until ere long we may be hopelessly reduced to a dependence upon the will of the slaveholding interest. It was the opinion of the late venerable John Quincy Adams, that, long since, the slave representation gave this interest sufficient power to control the government. Said Mr. Adams : " Nay, I may go further, and insist that this (the slave) representation has ever been, in fact, the ruling power of this government. The history of the Union has afforded a continual proof that this representation of property, which they enjoy, has secured to the slaveholding states, the control of the national policy, and almost without exception, the possession of the highest executive office of the Union."

Now, what was the bargain or compromise? That the slaveholding states were to be allowed a representation for three fifths of their slaves—their property—and when direct taxes

were to be levied, they were to be apportioned upon the same basis. The expectation *then* was that the expenses of the government were mainly to be paid by direct taxation, in which event the slaveholding states would have paid taxes for three fifths of their slaves. They have had their property representation but have never paid the equivalent. The policy of the government has been changed. The revenue has been raised in another way, and the slaveholders have not only had the representation, but they have made it a source of profit, by adopting it as the basis in the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands and of the surplus revenue. "The whole nett revenue of the government from the 4th of March 1787 to Jan'y. 1st, 1848, has amounted in round numbers to \$1,075,000,000. Direct taxation has been resorted to in but four instances: a tax of two millions was laid in 1789, a tax of three millions in 1813, a tax of six millions in 1815; and a tax of three millions in 1816: and of this amount but \$12,750,000 have been received into the U. S. Treasury, of which the South has paid for her slave representation only \$1,256,553. Had the revenue of the government been raised by direct taxation, the South would have had to pay for her slave representation over 115 millions of dollars, [115,089-371 ;] but instead of that sum, she has paid but about one million and a quarter. Of \$562,144 derived from the sales of the Public lands in the half year ending June 30th, 1842, and distributed by act of Congress, the South received for her slaves \$57,556. Of the \$37,468,859.97 surplus revenue distributed by the Act of 1836, the South, with a free population of 3,823,289, received \$16,058,082.85, while the North, with a free population of 7,008,451 received but \$21,410,777.12. So that for each inhabitant of the *free* North, there were received but \$3.06 ; while for each *free* person in the South there were received \$4.20, or \$1.14 more for each free person in the South, than for each free person in the North. Consequently the South by this operation alone received for her slave representation in Congress, \$4,358,549 ! And when we deduct the amount the South has *paid* in direct taxes (\$1,256,553) for her slaves, from the amount received for her slaves, from the proceeds of the public lands, and for the surplus revenue, there remain \$3,159,452, which the government has paid the South for the compromise, or, as a bonus for slaveholding."

"The South, then, has not paid a single dollar for her slave representation. On the contrary, the North has made the South a free grant of one ninth of the Representatives in Congress, and then as a compensation for monopolizing the offices, usurping the authority of the government, and ruling the North with a rod of iron, the North has voted the South the sum of over three millions of dollars!"

This matter of the inequality of representation and of political power, is of sufficient importance to justify our looking a little further into its bearings. At the Presidential election in 1840, the vote of *one* Southern man counted as much as the votes of *two* Northern men. To elect a Presidential elector in the slave states, 1840, it required 5,935 votes—to elect one in the free states it required 10,278 votes, and thus in the election of a President of the United States, the votes of 10,278 men at the North exerted no more influence than the votes of 5,935 men at the South. At the Presidential election of 1844, the votes of 6,608 men at the South exerted an influence equal to that of 11,000 men at the North. At the recent Presidential election the votes of 7,533 men at the South exerted an influence equal to that of 12,042 men at the North. The two states of New York and Pennsylvania, polled within 17,000 of as many votes as were polled by the whole 15 slave states exclusive of South Carolina, while the slave states had 112 votes in the electoral college, and New York and Pennsylvania united, but 62. The state of New York alone polled within 11,000 of as many votes as were polled by Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Maryland, Florida and Texas, while these states had 71 votes in the choice of President, and New York but 36. Texas polled but 12,654 votes, while Wisconsin polled 37,721, and yet Texas had as many votes in the electoral college as Wisconsin; thus the vote of one man in Texas exerted as much influence in the choice of a President of the United States as did the votes of yourself, Mr. Chairman, united to those of any other two members of this body! Whilst we honorably abide by the compromises of the Constitution, and do nothing for the removal of slavery but what we are clearly at liberty to do in strict compliance with its provisions, let us—O! let us, in the name of all that is good and sacred, in the name of justice and humanity, out of regard to our own rights and in mercy to our posterity, let us declare, that this accursed

thing of chattel slavery, so far as our influence goes, shall extend no further, and that this inequality of representation and of political power, shall never be increased if we can prevent it. If we allow the slave interest to triumph at this present crisis, all may be lost. For years past this interest has had its eye steadily fixed upon the accomplishment of one grand object, to increase its power and influence so as to bring under its control the operations of the Federal Government, in all time to come. Texas was annexed for this purpose. The Mexican war, and the acquisition of the immense territories of New Mexico and California, to be converted into new slave states, were the steps by which this great end was to be secured. Are these statements doubted? We have the proof in the testimony of the slaveholders themselves.

While the Mexican war was in progress, the *Charleston Patriot* said, "We trust our Southern representatives will remember that this is a *Southern war*." Do any wish to know what they mean by a Southern war? Let the *Charleston Courier* explain: "Every battle fought in Mexico, and every dollar spent there, but insures the *acquisition of territory*, which must widen the field of southern enterprize and power for the future: and the final result will be so to adjust the whole balance of power in the confederacy, as to give us *the control over the operations of the government in all time to come*." But it may be asked, was this feeling entertained any where else than in South Carolina? Let the "*Federal Union*," published in Georgia, answer: "The whigs of the North oppose the war, because its legitimate effect is, as they contend, the extension of southern territory and *Southern slavery*. It is true this is a war in which the South is more immediately interested. Its vast expenditures must be made within her limits. During its continuance, New York, the great emporium of commerce, must be shorn in part of her greatness. Exchange, usually in her favor, must now be reversed, and in favor of New Orleans, where the supplies are furnished for the army. Let the South now be true to herself, and the days of her vassalage are gone for ever." These extracts are but fair samples of the tone of the Southern press generally.

While the Wilmot Proviso was under discussion in Congress, at the time the war was in progress, Southern members openly avowed their feelings and their determination

on this subject. Mr. Seddon, of Virginia, declared the Proviso "a gross and offensive proposition, outraging the whole scope and spirit of the Constitution. The South never would—never could *prosecute conquests* which were to be made instruments of attack upon her institutions. *She never would acquiesce in the acquisition of territory from which her sons with their property were to be wholly excluded.*"

Mr. Dargan, of Alabama: "Say to the South, that they are only fighting to make FREE TERRITORY, and they will demand the settlement of this question now, preliminary to any further prosecution of the war."

Mr. Leake, of Virginia: "If the present attempt to impose limitation with respect to the EXTENSION of SLAVERY should be persisted in, and should prevail, the South must stand in self-defence, for they could not, and would not submit to it."

Mr. Tibbats of Kentucky: "If the people of the South are to be told that in acquiring territory for which their blood is to be spilled, and their treasures expended, they are realizing benefits for others in which they are to have no share, then *I am against keeping one foot of Mexican territory. I am opposed to carrying on this war on such terms.*"

Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina: "I am a Southern man and a slaveholder. I say for one, I would rather meet any extremity upon earth, than give up one inch of our equality."

Mr. Bagby, of Alabama: "If the time should come when this principle was to be acted upon, that no more territory was to be acquired, lest *Southern institutions* should exist in such territory, he would say, AWAY WITH THE UNION."

Mr. Butler, of South Carolina—"Would, before God, warn gentlemen, if the South was to be regarded and treated with inequality, they would *tear up the instrument* (the Constitution) to which they had subscribed in good faith."

Mr. Kauffman, of Texas: "Should the proposed amendment (the Proviso) be adopted, *all hopes of acquiring territory in that quarter are gone for ever.* The South would never consent under such a state of things to add any territory to what we now possess."

Mr. Thompson, of Mississippi: "The passage of the amendment would be the DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION."

It may perhaps be objected that these are nothing more than the views of isolated individuals, and do not correctly

indicate the sentiments of the slaveholders generally. Would the views of Southern Governors and Southern Legislatures be any more authoritative?

The Governor of Virginia thus discourses: "It is unquestionably true, that if our slaves *were restricted to our present limits, they would greatly decrease in value, and thus seriously impair the fortunes of their owners.* The South can never consent to be confined to prescribed limits. *She wants and must have space.*"

The Governor of Mississippi is equally decided in the expression of his views: "No man who sympathizes with the sentiments put forth in the Wilmot Proviso, ought to have, or in my opinion will have a single electoral vote from the Southern States. We may be in favor of establishing the Rio Grande as the boundary up to the parallel of 36° 30' to the Pacific, but we will not submit to be told that slave territory is not to be acquired on this or on the other side of that line."

The Governors of other slaveholding states have expressed similar sentiments. There seems to be no diversity of opinion among those who are interested in sustaining the supremacy of the slave interest.

The Legislature of Virginia "*Resolved unanimously, That under no circumstances will this body recognize as binding, any enactment of the Federal Government, which has for its object the prohibition of slavery in any territory to be acquired by conquest or treaty.*"

The Legislature of Louisiana resolved as above, with the addition—"South of the line of the Missouri compromise."

The Legislature of Georgia "*Resolved, That it is the duty of every man in every section of this confederacy, if the Union be dear to him, to oppose the passage of any law or resolution of Congress by which territory acquired, or to be acquired, may be subjected to any restriction against slavery.*"

The slaveholders are in earnest in this matter. They are determined to bring every thing under their control. This great issue is to be met just here. The North have yielded long enough. They must now stand firm. To instruct merely to *vote for* the Wilmot Proviso is not enough. They must oppose *every thing* without this. There must be no compromise. To yield at all is to give up every thing. The only way to succeed is to stand firm and immovable in

defence of the right. Stand as they did in the case of Oregon, and the South will finally yield. The evils which will result should the South now gain their point, will be a thousand times greater than all the evils which could possibly result, should there be no other government than that which now exists in New Mexico and California for ten years to come. Offer them a good government, based upon the principles of right and liberty, and if the South reject it, let them bear the responsibility.

I will now briefly notice two objections to the passage of the resolutions, and then I will relieve your patience.

First, So far as New Mexico and California are concerned, the resolutions are entirely useless, for slavery cannot exist there without positive law authorising it. Judge McLean, Judge Bronson, and Chancellor Walworth are quoted as authority for the correctness of this position. As an abstract proposition, it is without doubt true that there can be no *legal* slavery in these territories without positive law to authorize its existence. And it is equally true, if we go back to first principles, and give to *law* its true and appropriate meaning, that there is no such thing, and there can be no such thing as *legal slavery* any where. It is contrary to natural justice, and cannot be made right by any human authority. But as a *practical* question, the opinions of the distinguished jurists named amount to nothing.

Blackstone says: "All enactments, contrary to the principles of natural justice, are void *ab initio*."

Slavery is a lawless institution. It never has been created by positive law, and yet it exists. If the opinion already referred to proves any thing, it proves too much. If slavery cannot exist without positive law to establish it, as no such laws have ever been passed to establish it, then there can be no such thing as slavery! And this is just as true *in fact* as it would be that slavery would not exist in New Mexico and California, were not laws passed to prevent it, and no more so. The slaveholders ask for no law to authorize them to go into these new territories with their slaves. They claim the right to do it without law, and once having succeeded, they calculate to depend upon *their own laws* to protect them in it.

Texas, as you are well aware, Sir, claims jurisdiction over a large portion of New Mexico, and she is extending her laws and her slaves over it. What, then, becomes of the

security against slavery afforded by this *positive-law* position?

"Judge Beads has gone to New Mexico," (so says the Fayette, Howard County, Times,) "by authority of the Governor of Texas, to act there in his judicial capacity, and the slaveholders are moving in with their slaves from all directions."

When they are once there with their slaves, can they not hold them, provided Congress should not pass the Wilmot Proviso? Should this question be tested at all, it must be by their own courts. What is Southern law on this point? We have a case in point decided by the Supreme Court of Missouri at the October term 1847.

"Charlotte (of color) vs Chouteau—Appeal from Circuit Court—Reversed."

1. Slavery may exist without any positive law authorizing it.

2. The existence of slavery, in fact, is presumptive evidence of its legality.

3. It is not necessary to show any general custom in a country of holding negroes in slavery to prove its legality. If it be found to exist *in fact*, even to a limited extent—and no positive law prohibiting it be shown, it will be deemed legal.

It is not the policy of the slave states to favor the liberation of negroes."

If such be the law of slaveholding states, of what practical avail is the position that slavery cannot exist, without first being created by positive laws?

The second and last objection to the passage of these resolutions I design to notice is, that by so doing we are making a sectional matter of it.

This is by no means a sectional movement. The whole number of slaveholders is but about 300,000. No others than these, and those immediately connected with them, desire the extension of slavery, and very many of these, even in some of the more Northern of the slave states are opposed to it. A small minority, of some 200,000 perhaps, wish to have their own way, and to control all the rest, in a population of 20,000,000!

If slavery be the evil thing that I have proved it to be, and the number who wish to extend it is so few, then certainly to oppose their designs is not a sectional movement

The good of the whole country will be promoted by such opposition. Look for a moment at the actual position of matters. At the close of the Revolutionary war, when our forefathers were assembled in Convention for the organization of a permanent Government, they found in their midst an institution based upon principles antagonist to the great truths of the Declaration of Independence, and to all the principles of their free institutions. It was admitted to be so on all hands. Many were desirous of ridding the country of it at once, but the supposed interests of the more Southern States were so closely interwoven with it that they would not consent to give it up. After long and patient consultation, they framed their Constitution, but carefully refrained from alluding in plain terms to this evil institution, and employed language that might refer to it, or to something else, and that would require no alteration when this institution was removed.

"At the adoption of the Federal constitution, slavery existed in all the states of the Union but New Hampshire and Massachusetts: still all were opposed to it in theory but Georgia and South Carolina. During the Revolution and under the articles of confederation, its inconsistency with the Declaration of Independence, the professions of the colonies, and the almost universal desire for liberty, had been deeply felt: and that, at the formation of the new Constitution, and for a time subsequently, the sincere determination was uniform, not merely not to *extend* it to new territory, but to rid the country of it at no distant day, is obvious from the history of that period touching the institution.

"1st, No man advocated the system on principle. All admitted it to be a political and moral evil, and a cruel outrage upon the rights of man.

"2nd, Our public men of that day were uniform in denouncing it. Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Wythe, Franklin—most, if not *all*, the leading minds of that day were open and bold in opposing it.

"3d, All the states assembled in the old Continental Congress in 1787—they ear the Constitution was framed—passed unanimously, the memorable ordinance prohibiting slavery in the North Western Territory; (*the only territory belonging to government*) and provided for its being subsequently divided into free states.

"4th, It was the general belief that the abolition of the foreign slave trade would secure the entire abolition of slavery, which was authorized at the end of twenty years.

"5th, The delegates from the Convention which formed the Constitution went home, organized abolition societies, became their active and efficient members, and petitioned the first Congress under the new Constitution, for the abolition of slavery.

"6th, The States then free, and expecting shortly to become free, were all North of Maryland, seven in number, which, with the five to be made out of the North West Territory, would be but six slave states, including Delaware, which had then, and has had ever since, very little interest in supporting slavery."

The current set strongly against slavery for a number of years, until by reason of the invention of the cotton gin, the slaveholders conceived the idea that they could make slavery profitable, and immediately they wheeled "right about face," and set themselves to work to strengthen, and perpetuate, to enlarge and extend their evil institution. It is the slaveholders who have violated the spirit of the compromises of the Constitution—it is the slaveholders who have failed to carry out the *unrecorded* understanding of that day, and it is the North, and not the South, that have reason to complain.

I unhesitatingly challenge the whole country to produce any substantial evidence to prove that there was the least understanding at the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution, that slavery was ever to be *extended*; or to disprove the position I have taken—that the understanding then was, that *its existence was merely tolerated for the time being*.

Look at this institution in its true character, as a vast, powerful monopoly—with a capital of hundreds of millions of dollars—with hundreds of thousands interested in sustaining it—bound together by a common interest, and acting as a solid body—as one man—and we can understand the secret of its power. You who were so much opposed to the United States Bank, with a capital of but 35 millions—had that no power for evil? Could that exert no influence over the legislation of the country? Had that no power to corrupt the purity of our elections? Were you opposed to that on principle? With what consistency, then, can you look with indifference upon this monopoly, a thousand times

more mighty for evil than was that ? It has gone on increasing, enlarging and extending its power and influence, until it has brought almost every thing under its control—and now comes again to us with the most extravagant and insulting demand that it may be allowed still further to extend its limits, and increase its power.

This slaveholding interest has controlled the affairs of the nation. The power of this mighty monopoly has been irresistible, and the North have bowed before it.

John Randolph, in the debate upon the Missouri Question, said : “ We do not govern them (the people of the North) *by our black slaves, but by their own white ones. We know what we are doing.* We of the South are always united from the Ohio to Florida ; and we can always unite, but you of the North are beginning to divide. *We have conquered you once, and we can, and will conquer you again.* Aye, sir, *we will drive you to the wall, and when we have you there again, we mean to keep you there, and nail you down like base money.*”

The slaveholders have held the offices of the National Government at their disposal, and no Northern man dare aspire to any important station without bowing to their demands. Oh ! sir, it is a humiliating fact, but it is, nevertheless, true. Almost all our great men who have aspired to the Presidency, have bowed down and worshipped. Martin Van Buren did it before he secured the prize in 1837. General Harrison did it. He was endorsed at the South as sound to the core on the slavery question, before they would support him, and in his Inaugural Message he substantially repeated the veto pledge of Mr. Van Buren. Daniel Webster yielded homage to the Moloch of slavery on the steps of the Richmond State house. “beneath the rays of an October sun,” at the time when he was looking with longing eyes to the succession. Buchanan and Dallas and others who have had their eyes fixed upon that goal have taken the oath of allegiance to the slave interest by their various letters and speeches on its behalf. And Lewis Cass, I say it in all kindness, bows to this monopoly, in his Nicholson letter. He did no more than others before him had done—he supposed that was still the road to the Presidential chair—but he reckoned without his host—a change had come over the people—at the South they demanded still more abject worship of the monster—and at the North the people were wak-

ing up to the encroachments of slavery, and were demanding an independent, out-spoken friend of liberty as the occupant of the Presidential chair—and between the two, Lewis Cass lost the prize he sought to obtain.

One word to my Taylor friends in passing. Has the cause of freedom gained any thing by your success? Is the power of this great monopoly broken by electing to the Presidency one of its chief stockholders—a man interested in a thousand ways to sustain its supremacy? Has this argus-eyed monster been caught asleep? Has it betrayed itself? Has it lost sight of its great and absorbing object? Has it elevated to power a traitor to its interests? No! No! as John Randolph said on another occasion, they could have said—“We know what we are about”—we know our man, and we are content to bide our time.

It is the North and not the South that have been deceived in the recent election, and I will only add that time will make it manifest. Thus has this monopoly of the slave interest governed and controlled us.

And is it sectional, is it anti-democratic to oppose the extension of the power of this great monopoly? Why should any true Democrat hesitate to vote for the resolutions? Are they looking forward to a union with the slave interest in the election of the President in 1852? It is all in vain. The unholy bands that bound the Northern Democracy to the great monopoly of Southern slavery are broken. The refusal of the South to sustain Lewis Cass was an unpardonable offense, and one that never will be forgiven. The alliance was an unnatural one. There never was any real affinity between Northern democracy and Southern slavery. The separation should be total and final. Our duty is plainly before us—will we do it? Shall we act the part of men in the settlement of this great question—the most important one of the age? Upon its right issue, hang interests the most important and momentous.

If slavery triumphs, we behold in the future evils the most portentous—we see slavery spreading over the vast territories of New Mexico and California, adding new slave states to the Union—consolidating its power, changing the objects and designs of our government, ruling the North with a rod of iron, and reducing it to a condition of mere vassalage to the slave power, until, finally, we shall be reduced to

a condition scarcely more to be desired than that of the poor slave, toiling on a southern plantation.

But if we remain firm—if we stand true to the principles of Democracy—if we maintain the right with bold hearts and strong hands—we shall succeed in stopping the further extension of slavery—we shall remove it from the National Capital, abolish the awful traffic in human beings where we have the constitutional power to do so—hem the monster within its present limits, cripple its power, and it will inevitably die, and its withering curse will be removed from the land. We shall then be a band of brethren—with no conflicting interests—with nothing to disturb our peace and harmony, and we shall go on increasing in power and influence and glory, until we shall occupy an eminence among the nations of the earth, higher and more exalted than that occupied by any nation that has gone before us.

Note.—After an animated and protracted discussion in both Houses, the Resolutions were finally passed in the following modified form, by a vote of 10 to 6 in the Senate, on the 3d of February, and in the Assembly by 34 to 24 on the 7th instant.

Resolved, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Wisconsin, That our Senators in Congress be, and they are hereby instructed, and our Representatives requested:—

“1st. To oppose the passage of any Act for the government of New Mexico and California or any other territory now belonging to the United States, or which may hereafter be acquired, unless it shall contain a provision forever prohibiting the introduction of Slavery or involuntary servitude into said territories, except as a punishment for crime.

“2d. To oppose the admission of any more Slave States into the Federal Union.

“3d. To exert their influence to procure the repeal of all laws sustaining Slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, or in any other place under the control of the National government, and to secure the passage of laws prohibiting slavery and the slave-trade under the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government.

“*Resolved*, That His Excellency the Governor is hereby requested immediately to forward a copy of the foregoing resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to be by them laid before Congress.”